

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ALICIA LADONNE WRIGHT,
a/k/a ALESHIA WRIGHT, a/k/a ALICIA
LADONNE HILL, a/k/a ALISHA HILL, a/k/a
ALISHIA HILL, a/k/a ALICIA L. HILL, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

GEORGE EDWARD WRIGHT, JR., a/k/a,
GEORGE E. WRIGHT, JR.,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED
December 28, 2004

No. 254680
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 89-282054-NA

Before: Meter, P.J., and Wilder and Schuette, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the trial court's order terminating his parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(h) and (k)(ii). We affirm.

I. FACTS

Respondent obtained full custody of Alicia after she was found to be neglected in her mother's home. However, beginning in December of 2002, Alicia stated that respondent had touched her in inappropriate ways including having oral, vaginal, and other inappropriate forms of sexual contact with her body. Respondent has allegedly done this on more than ten occasions. Respondent was convicted by a guilty plea of one count of first degree criminal sexual conduct involving a person under age thirteen. Alicia was placed with her mother but kept in contact with respondent. At the termination hearing, Alicia expressed that she desired to continue a relationship with respondent and wanted him to have some decision-making power in her future.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

In order to terminate parental rights, the trial court must find that at least one of the statutory grounds for termination in MCL 712A.19b(3) has been met by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Jackson*, 199 Mich App 22, 25; 501 NW2d 182 (1993), citing *In re McIntyre*, 192 Mich App 47, 50; 480 NW2d 293 (1991). "Once a ground for termination is established, the

court must issue an order terminating parental rights unless there exists clear evidence, on the whole record, that termination is not in the child's best interests." *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 354; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); MCL 712A.19b(5). We review the trial court's determination for clear error. *In re Trejo, supra* at 356-357.

III. ANALYSIS

Respondent argues that the trial court erred because termination of his parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. It is evident that a bond existed between respondent and the child and the child desired to continue a relationship with respondent. However, given respondent's past history of serious sexual abuse of the child, for which he was convicted of first-degree criminal sexual conduct involving a minor under age thirteen, we find that the evidence failed to establish that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. *In re Trejo, supra* at 354. That the child desired to continue a relationship with respondent does not "clearly overwhelm" the serious allegations of repeated sexual abuse of the child by respondent. *Id.* Therefore, we find that termination of respondent's parental rights to the minor child was appropriate.

Affirmed.

/s/ Patrick M. Meter
/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder
/s/ Bill Schuette